7/15/84 U3780-1.18-F

Welfare Incidence and Welfare Dependency Among American Women: A Longitudinal Examination

by

Frank L. Mott

February 1983

Welfare Incidence and Welfare Dependency Among American Women: A Longitudinal Examination

Frank L. Mott
Center for Human Resource Research
The Ohio State University

February 1983

This paper was prepared under a contract with the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor under the authority of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgments. Interpretations or viewpoints contained in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor. The author wishes to thank his many colleagues at The Center for Human Resource Research for their helpful comments on an earlier draft and Jean Haurin for her outstanding research assistance.

Abstract

This research uses data from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Work Experience of Young Women, spanning the 1968 to 1980 period, to measure the incidence and intensity of welfare attachment. In addition to examining the propensity of young women and their families to repeatedly receive welfare, both within and across generations, the research examines variations in short and longer term welfare receipt by race, family status and socioeconomic background. The results indicate that while relatively large proportions of women require welfare assistance at some time, a relatively small proportion of women account for a large part of the welfare case load. Family and employment considerations both are important predictors of longer term welfare attachment for both black and white women.

Consistent with evidence from other research, the results suggest that the probability of subsequently leaving the welfare rolls declines sharply as duration of time on the rolls increases. Also, there is only limited support for the notion that a propensity to be on welfare is transmitted across generations. Finally, the results indicate that the greater propensity for black women to receive welfare reflects for the most part differences in family and socioeconomic characteristics between the races. There is no support for the thesis that black families are more likely to repeatedly receive welfare after controlling for socioeconomic and demographic differences between the races.

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction.....1

The Research Objectives.....1

The Data Set and Definition of Welfare.....5

Overall Trends in Welfare and Poverty Status, 1968 to 1978.....7

Welfare, Poverty and Employment.....9

The Incidence and Intensity of Welfare Receipt, 1968-1980.....11

The Determinants of Welfare Incidence and Prevalence: A Multivariate Perspective.....13

The Research.....13

Characteristics of the Welfare Population.....17

Determinants of Welfare Receipt in 1978: A Cross-Sectional Analysis.....19

Variations in Determinants of Welfare Receipt by Type of Welfare Received.....23

Determinants of Ever Having Received Welfare Since Leaving the Parental Home.....25

Who are the Welfare Repeaters?.....28

Summary and Conclusions.....32

Footnotes.....36

References.....39

INTRODUCTION

A growing body of literature in recent years has documented the heterogeneity of the "welfare population" and the diverse reasons why people go on welfare. The better-documented studies in this research area have utilized the University of Michigan Population Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) to consider issues associated with welfare for a full cross-section of the population. These studies and others suggest that young women in the principal childbearing years frequently are prime candidates for receiving welfare, because of the cost of rearing children and the constraint young children impose on a woman's ability to work, particularly in households where no adult man is present (Duvall, et al., 1982; Haggstrom, et al., 1981; Coe, 1981).

This study focuses on these young women and examines (1) trends in welfare receipt for these women and their families between 1968 and 1980, and (2) how the incidence and intensity of welfare receipt may be sensitive to background characteristics of a woman and her family. A particular emphasis of the research will be to measure the extent to which young women and their families evidence welfare dependency--both within and across generations. The data are from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Work Experience of Young Women (NLS); respondents were first interviewed when they were 14 to 24 years of age in 1968, were still being interviewed in 1980 and had been interviewed in all ten surveys during that twelve year period.[1]

THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

There is a consensus that welfare and poverty statistics can be easily

misinterpreted, depending on the nature of the statistics. For example, an examination of cross-sectional welfare statistics at any one point in time can overstate the proportion of long term cases because those family units or individuals who have above average tendencies to remain on welfare will have accumulated on the rolls. Retrospective reporting, on the other hand, can lead to an understatement of welfare levels for those who received it in the more distant past. An accurate portrayal of the true relationship between short and long term welfare attachment requires panel data (such as the NLS or PSID) which follows the same individuals over a lengthy period of time (see Coe, 1981 for an extensive discussion of this issue). A particular advantage of the NLS in this regard is that it follows a large cohort of young women in the childbearing years. This cohort also includes a substantial over-sampling of black young women (about 30 percent of the total sample), thus permitting a careful examination of a group about whom there is particular policy interest.

Recent research generally supports the notion that although relatively large proportions of the adult population may need to receive welfare for brief periods of time, much smaller proportions spend a substantial proportion of their lives on welfare (Bumpass and Sweet, 1981; Levitan, et al., 1972; Coe, 1981; Boskin and Nold, 1975; Coe, 1979). The specific welfare probabilities indicated by different researchers vary across surveys, reflecting differences in sample selection, time references and definitions of welfare; but the above generalization is supported by most research. One objective of the present study is to examine welfare prevalence over a fairly lengthy period among a nationally representative sample of young adult black and white women. Such a study has not previously been accomplished.

A related objective here is to measure the extent to which the relationship between ever receiving welfare and continually receiving welfare

varies between young women who have different characteristics and between white and black women. Some other studies suggest that women with low potential wages (Boskin and Nold, 1975; Coe, 1979), who are black (Coe, 1981; Ross and Sawhill, 1975; Wiseman, 1976; Boskin and Nold, 1975; Coe, 1978), or less educated (Coe, 1979) are more likely to be among the long-term welfare group. However, these results are not incontrovertible as Barr and Hill (1981) found no evidence of racial differences in welfare prevalence after controlling for a range of socioeconomic background factors and Coe (1981) found that human capital variables were only associated with above average propensities for short-term welfare receipt. This study will more effectively control for temporally contiguous and earlier status variables than has been possible in many other studies and it will thus perhaps suggest more clearly whether factors such as race and education are truly independent predictors of short and long term welfare access.

There has also been considerable interest in whether or not any pronounced tendency shows up for welfare to be self-perpetuating, both within and across generations. Substantial evidence suggests that the longer an individual and his or her family are on welfare, the lower the likelihood that they will subsequently leave the welfare rolls (Coe, 1981; Coe, 1979; Rein and Rainwater, 1978).[2] These "repeaters" may account for only a small proportion of the individuals receiving welfare but a much larger proportion of the total cumulated cases over time (Coe, 1981). This issue has major policy significance: the kinds of remedies required for keeping family units from needing income transfers can be quite different, depending on whether they need help during a short transition or long term help because they have no potential breadwinner. Rein and Rainwater (1978) for example, find no significant welfare class per se, but they do observe that families seek

welfare for a number of reasons. Substantial numbers undoubtedly use welfare temporarily during transitions between jobs or life cycle stages or in other situations of unusual but temporary financial stress. Perhaps some individuals go on welfare as part of an "income maximizing strategy"; these, in the words of Rein and Rainwater "have income options other than welfare, but opt to rely upon welfare as the stable foundation for their income package" (Rein and Rainwater, 1978, p. 530). Finally, a third group, of undefined size, are in a sense (again, following the terminology of Rein and Rainwater) "locked in" to welfare. These individuals "lack a social support system to aid them in altering their circumstances"--and for various reasons are unable to alter their circumstances on their own. Most evidence suggests that the first of the three categories dominate the welfare rolls. Although the NLS includes no direct information about the motives of the young female respondents, these longitudinal data permit analysis of the extent to which welfare use is self-perpetuating and whether or not a substantial proportion of all welfare cases over a period of time can be attributed to a relatively small percentage of the population.

Finally, to the extent the data permit, this research will consider whether there is evidence of an intergenerational transmission of a propensity to be on welfare, an issue which permeates the welfare-related social policy literature of the past two decades. No definitive quantitative studies of this issue exist, but there are numerous ideological differences of opinion. Earlier literature (e.g., Moynihan, 1965; Frazier, 1966; Greenleigh, 1969) tended to support the idea that there is indeed an intergenerational transmission of poverty "values," but more recent literature (e.g., Rossi and Blum, 1968; Goodwin, 1972; Rein and Rainwater, 1978) disputes the earlier theoretical orientation as well as the quantitative findings.[3] Most recent

quantitative studies of this issue support the notion that poverty or welfare values per se are not transmitted (e.g., Harrison, 1977, cited in Coe, 1981; Rein and Rainwater, 1978). Using the PSID, Rein and Rainwater, in particular, found that after controlling for poverty background no evidence of welfare dependency in children's own homes appears at subsequent points in time; i.e., there is no apparent tendency for welfare to be perpetuated into the second generation, once earnings of parents are controlled for. Because this study focuses specifically on a sample of young women in the NLS who were still living with their parents in 1968, it can consider this issue directly.

THE DATA SET AND DEFINITION OF WELFARE

This study examines the welfare propensities of the 2,492 white and 877 black young women who were 14 to 24 years of age when first interviewed in 1968, and for whom all of the relevant information was available for all ten interviews between 1968 and 1980. The young women were interviewed each year between 1968 and 1973, and again in 1975, 1977, 1978 and 1980. By the 1980 survey they were ages 26 to 36.

Whether or not they were welfare recipients was determined for all surveys between 1968 and 1977 by response to a question "Did anyone in this family receive any welfare or public assistance in the last 12 months?" Welfare receipt in 1978 was based on a positive response to any of several questions asking about receipt of food stamps, A.F.D.C., Supplemental Security income or any other public assistance from the local, state or federal government by either the respondent or her husband. Finally, in 1980, welfare receipt was defined on the basis of a positive response to either of two questions--receipt by the respondent or her husband of food stamps during the

past twelve months or receipt of any other public welfare or public assistance. An examination of welfare receipt trend lines between 1968-1977 and 1978 suggested no apparent discontinuity due to wording discrepancies.[4] Also, it should be noted that the 1968-1977 responses focused on welfare assistance to anyone in the family, including not only spouses, but also parents and other relatives: this fact is important because the young women in this sample were at the life cycle stage where they typically were moving from their parents' homes to their own household. Having this information both for when the respondent was living in her parental home and when she moved into her own household permits consideration of issues associated with propensities toward intergenerational welfare transmission.

The more elaborate itemization of welfare sources specified in the 1978 NLS interview schedule indicated that the single most important welfare source for this population group is food stamps (78 percent of all welfare recipients) followed by Aid for Dependent Children (48 percent) and "other sources" (26 percent). The distribution of welfare receipt by source was similar for black and white respondents. The percentages exceed 100 percent because an individual or her family could be receiving more than one form of welfare. Indeed, three quarters of women receiving A.F.D.C. also were receiving food stamps and about half of women receiving food stamps were receiving A.F.D.C. Much smaller proportions were receiving one of the above as well as other welfare funds. This pattern is very similar to other evidence from the new (1979) Youth Cohort of the National Longitudinal Surveys for a somewhat comparable group of young women (see Mott and Maxwell, 1981).

OVERALL TRENDS IN WELFARE AND POVERTY STATUS, 1968 TO 1978

The income, poverty and welfare status of an individual and her family can be quite sensitive to her life cycle stage, whether or not she is still in her parental home, her marital status and whether or not she has children of her own.[5] As can be seen in Table 1, in 1968 about 3 of every 5 respondents in the sample were living with their parents, and only 1 in 5 was a mother living in her own household. By 1978, only about 7 percent were still living with their parents; not surprisingly, the dominant group, almost 70 percent, were young mothers living in their own homes. The welfare implications of these differing life cycle stages are considerable, particularly because the reference unit for the question on welfare in most of the surveys was the family unit in which the respondent resided.

When the respondent was living with her parents the question pertained to everyone in her parents' household, which in some cases included many individuals (Mott and Maxwell, 1981). Once they left their parents' residence, the average family typically includes only the respondent, her children and possibly her spouse. Although these nuclear families have fewer individuals who could be receiving welfare, their probabilities of doing so are perhaps higher, particularly in family units including a child, but no father.

Table 2 shows that between 1968 and 1978, the overall percentage of the young women's family units receiving at least some welfare payments increased from 4.6 to 9.7 percent with substantial percentage increases being noted for both races, although the black levels at both points in time were considerably higher than the white levels. Note that the percentage of family units in poverty was declining substantially for both races during the same decade.

Table 2 also shows that this increase in welfare receipt over the decade reflected almost entirely increases for young mothers living in their own households, the group which absolutely and proportionately showed the largest increase over that time period. This group, incidentally, also showed some decline in poverty status over the decade. Once again, this trend was prevalent for both races, although levels of involvement with welfare and poverty were substantially higher for black families in both 1968 and 1978.[6]

As of 1978, 9.7 percent of the women (then 24 to 34) and their families were receiving welfare--about 7 percent of whites and 31 percent of blacks. About the same percentages were in poverty. In contrast, in 1968, the percentage of family units in poverty far exceeded the percentages on welfare.

A number of reasons have been suggested for this change in the relationship between welfare receipt and poverty status over the decade. Although these reasons are listed here, an evaluation of their relevance is beyond the scope of this research. In addition, the pattern of welfare regulation changes cannot be comprehensively considered in an abbreviated manner because of state variations in regulations and the differential timing of changes in state regulations.[7] Reasons given for the increased incidence of welfare receipt in the late 1960s and early 1970s include (1) the increase in the real value of the average payment (Coe, 1981), (2) more extensive geographical coverage (Coe, 1981), (3) reduction in the effective tax rate and the related liberalization in the treatment of non-earnings income when determining eligibility (Wiseman, 1976), (4) a general increase in knowledge of the welfare system by the potentially eligible population (Lyon, 1976), and (5) the increasing legitimacy of welfare dependency among the potentially eligible population. In more recent years, the deteriorating employment situation has undoubtedly contributed to the burgeoning welfare rolls.

Focusing briefly on the household living in poverty, Table 3 shows the importance of parenthood as a determinant of welfare receipt and as a determinant of increases in welfare receipt over the decade. In 1968, about 27 percent of the relatively small number of family units that included mothers living in poverty were receiving welfare; by 1978, fully 65 percent of the much larger number of poverty households including mothers were on welfare. Among black poverty families in this status, 80 percent receive at least some form of welfare payment. These, indeed, are the groups which define the overall level of welfare participation for young women.

Welfare, Poverty and Employment

Although it is not the central theme of this paper, it is useful to examine the links between poverty, welfare and employment and whether they have been altered over the decade. These linkages are obviously sensitive to some of the changes in regulations and norms suggested in the preceding section.

Because overall levels of employment among young adults are related to age, independent of other life cycle events, Tables 4 and 5 include some summary statistics to show trends in the welfare-employment association for 20 to 24 year olds and 25 to 29 year olds at two points in time. Sample limitations constrain these comparisons to 20-24 year olds in 1968 and 1973 and 25-29 year olds in 1973 and 1978. Paralleling the earlier overall results, Table 4 shows that the proportion of mothers in each of the five year age groups receiving welfare increased over the two respective five year periods. No similar movement appeared for the percentages in poverty.

Examining the employed and not employed respondents separately, it may be

noted that although both groups witnessed increases in welfare participation, the trend for the not employed group was much more pronounced. For example, welfare probabilities for employed 20 to 24 year old mothers increased from about 7 to 10 percent between 1968 and 1973 compared with 7 and 21 percent for their non-working counterparts. A comparable trend may be noted between the mothers who were 25 to 29 in 1973 and 1978. Thus, while working mothers were somewhat more likely to supplement their family's income through welfare in the later 1970s, the likelihood of their receiving welfare in comparison with their non-working counterparts is substantially less than in earlier years.

The importance of employment as a mechanism for avoiding poverty may also be noted. This is perhaps more true now than in the late 1960s. The overall percent in poverty among the families of employed mothers declined over the decade. In contrast, poverty probabilities rose considerably for families of non-employed mothers.

Shifting focus slightly, Table 5 documents trends in several employment characteristics over the decade by the respondents' welfare and poverty status. Focusing on the mothers in the sample, several important trends may be noted. Whereas the overall level of employment for the mothers increased sharply during the decade, the percent of mothers living in poverty who were employed declined as did the employment rate for women on welfare. However, the employment rate for women on welfare but <u>not</u> in poverty rose substantially. Thus, significant numbers of women are clearly using the joint vehicles of welfare and employment to help raise their family's income above the poverty threshold.

It is also of some importance to note for the mothers on welfare <u>and</u> living in poverty, the enormous discrepancy between their labor force participation rates and their actual employment, particularly for the more

recent time periods. Among such 20 to 24 year old mothers in 1973, 39.1 percent were in the labor force but only 20 percent were employed, an effective unemployment rate of almost 50 percent! Among their 25 to 29 year old counterparts in 1978, about 25 percent were in the labor force but only 6 percent were employed. These statistics suggest rather strongly that this joint poverty-welfare status is not voluntary for many of the young mothers. In any event, it is clear that the capability of finding employment among these poor mothers on welfare dramatically worsened over the decade, undoubtedly reflecting at least in part deteriorating economic conditions, particularly for lesser skilled and educated women (Mott and Shapiro, 1983).

THE INCIDENCE AND INTENSITY OF WELFARE RECEIPT, 1968-1980

From a policy perspective, the motives for a family to be and remain on welfare are probably intricately related to their potential for getting off welfare. It has been suggested that the welfare population, as of one point in time, can be quite heterogeneous in this regard. While this research cannot untangle motives, what it can do is suggest the magnitudes of the prevalence of different welfare subgroups and, in the subsequent multivariate analysis, indicate whether or not there is any substantial basis for the notion that the propensity to be on welfare goes beyond the peculiar short term characteristics of a young woman, her family, and her environment.

Overall, 20.6 percent of the white respondents and 67.6 percent of the black respondents acknowledged receiving welfare in at least one survey year over the period under consideration (ten interviews actually encompassing a thirteen year period).[8,9] Thus, a significant majority of the young adult black female population and their families receive welfare at some point in

time compared to a much smaller but still substantial minority of the white population. The average white respondent reported receiving welfare .5 surveys over the decade compared with 2.8 surveys for her black counterpart. It is possible that the fairly ubiquitous prevalence of welfare within the black population has significant implications for the normative acceptability of welfare within that population subgroup. This issue will be considered further in the multivariate analysis below.

Black women are not only more likely to need welfare at some time, but in addition, are more likely to be repeaters. The average white woman (and her family) who received welfare over the ten survey period was on welfare 2.5 surveys, on the average, compared with 4.2 surveys for the average black. Table 6 specifies the distribution of the number of welfare appearances for this "ever welfare" population. It is clear that black women are more likely to repeatedly use welfare. Whereas about half of the white participants required welfare assistance in only one of the ten years, half of the black recipients reported receiving assistance in at least 4 of the 10 survey years. This differential may have significant implications for the kinds of assistance different welfare recipients may require. Table 7, which distributes the total number of welfare occurrences over the ten years (as opposed to number of welfare cases) in relation to the frequency with which the individuals involved received welfare may help clarify this point. For blacks, almost half of all the welfare occurrences are accounted for by women who were on welfare at least seven of the ten surveys. In contrast, almost half of all welfare occurrences among whites are by women who were on welfare three surveys or less. The capability for finding employment by the average woman who has been on welfare most surveys will probably be substantially below that of the woman who has required welfare assistance only once or

twice. It is suggested that the mix of funding allocations for direct income maintenance as contrasted with training, education or other vocational guidance, should be made with this temporal dimension in view. The average family where a woman has had only a brief interruption in her employment (or in her husband's employment) will probably require different forms of assistance than the family unit whose break with the labor market has been more extensive.

Finally, consistent with what has been reported using other survey data, particularly the PSID, the greater the length of time a respondent remains on welfare, the lower the likelihood that she will leave the welfare rolls (Coe, 1979; Rein and Rainwater, 1978). Table 8 includes welfare transition probabilities for black and white women who have been receiving welfare for varying numbers of successive surveys. While the probabilities fluctuate somewhat at the higher levels, reflecting smaller sample sizes, there is a fairly steady pattern of increased probabilities of remaining on welfare as the number of successive surveys one has been on welfare increase, although a plateau is ultimately reached. This relationship suggests that without outside intervention, the probability that an individual will leave the welfare rolls once she has been on the rolls for a period of time is very slim.

THE DETERMINANTS OF WELFARE INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE: A MULTIVARIATE PERSPECTIVE

The Research

In this section, multivariate techniques are used to examine differences between the determinants of welfare use for long and short term welfare recipients in comparison with respondents not receiving welfare. Three models

will be considered, focusing on different dimensions of welfare use and the welfare population. The first model will consider the determinants of welfare use in a cross-sectional context with the dependent variable being the probability of the respondent or her spouse receiving welfare in 1978. The independent variables will for the most part relate to the characteristics of the respondent and her environment as of that time. The sole exceptions will be two variables specifying whether or not the woman's parents were in poverty or receiving welfare when she last lived with them. This model is fairly standard in the sense that it taps the usual dimensions of one point in time attachment to welfare which have typically been considered by other researchers. What the individual predictors will purport to measure are (1) the extent to which shorter term exigencies such as inadequate income, employment and family status, or health are independent predictors of being on welfare at that particular time, (2) whether racial differences in this propensity appear after controlling for other factors and (3) whether there is any clear evidence of a direct intergenerational transmission of a tendency to receive welfare, for a point in time well removed from when the woman had lived with her parents.

This latter objective is operationalized as follows. First, the sample is constrained to young women who must have been living in their parental home in 1968, the first survey year. Second, the woman must have left her parental home before the 1973 survey, so as to ensure a reasonable number of years in which the woman was living in her own household as well as at least one survey (1978) temporally distant from when she resided with her parent(s). For all of the survey years in which she was living with her parents, welfare receipt of course refers to receipt by anyone in the parental household. The parent welfare variable in all of the models in this research is simply a dummy

variable specifying whether or not the parental household was receiving welfare for a majority of the survey years between 1968 and when the respondent left home.[10] The parental poverty status variable (according to standard OMB criteria)[11] was constructed in an analogous manner. While these variables have obvious limitations, they nonetheless permit some quantification of background welfare and poverty status. As such, it is possible to quantify the extent of cross-generational welfare attachment more effectively than do most other research efforts.

The cross-sectional analysis will also briefly and separately examine the independent predictors of A.F.D.C., food stamp and other welfare receipt during the year preceding the 1978 survey. The principal reasons for these analyses are to clarify whether our more general welfare analyses are substantially mis-stating the determinants of either of the two major welfare sources (e.g., food stamps and A.F.D.C.) for women in this age range. The 1978 survey round is the only one which included separate specification of these welfare components. If the determinants of these two welfare sources differ substantially from each other and from the overall cross-sectional model, conclusions drawn with regard to the overall welfare models included in this analysis would require qualification.

The second general model has as its outcome variable the probability that a respondent (or her family) ever received welfare in any survey year after leaving her parents' home. This variable encompasses, to the maximum extent feasible, all respondents who ever had a need to use the welfare system. It represents the least intensive but most extensive welfare group. From a program perspective, this group will maximally include respondents who need temporary assistance. As such it provides a good measure of the kinds of people who, in the long run, require welfare assistance, but in no way

represents a typical case load (e.g., the 1978 cross-section)--which would include a heavier representation of long term clients. The predictors included in this model are likewise of a longer-term nature, representing the longer term characteristics of the respondents and their environment. They include, for example, the proportion of the surveys since leaving home that the respondent was in poverty, had children in a never-married or separated capacity, was employed 26 or more weeks and so on (the complete model will be defined below). In addition, the same two parental background welfare and poverty variables specified earlier are also included in order to gain a measure of the independent effect of parental welfare involvement on this welfare extensiveness measure.

The third model, at the other extreme, represents an attempt to measure the determinants of the intensity of welfare participation in the years since leaving home limiting the sample to those women who ever received welfare. The dependent variable is the proportion of survey years since leaving home that the woman and her family received welfare and the independent variables are identical to those in the "ever welfare" model defined above. Whereas the above models are attempts to measure, first, the determinants of welfare involvement for a representative cross-section (akin to the population group receiving welfare in any one calendar year), and second, the characteristics of the typical American woman who ever receives welfare, this final model represents an attempt to describe the characteristics of the woman (and her family) who has a need to receive welfare on a more continuing basis. As suggested earlier, the program and policy considerations relevant for this group may differ substantially from those applicable for the "one timer." Also, while this group may not represent a large proportion of the families receiving welfare, they certainly represent a disproportionate portion of the

long term case load. To the extent that there is indeed an intergenerational propensity to maintain ties with the welfare rolls, the phenomenon is most likely to appear in this model.

Tables 9 through 12 include the full multivariate models where the outcomes are any welfare receipt in 1978 (1 = yes, 0 = no); A.F.D.C., food stamp, or other welfare receipt, respectively, in 1978 (1 = yes, 0 = no); ever received welfare (1 = yes, 0 = no); and, for those who ever received welfare, the proportion of surveys since leaving home in which welfare was received. All of the models in Tables 9, 11 and 12 are presented for two variants which include and exclude the parental background welfare and poverty variables, so as to permit a more careful consideration by the interested reader of the effects of these two background factors on the relationship between the other explanatory variables and the various outcomes. The explanatory variables for all of the models are defined in the tables.

Also, while ordinary least squares regression analysis is used for the welfare intensity model in Table 12, logit analyses are used for all the other models which have dichotomous dependent variables. Logit is used in these models to avoid the econometric problems associated with using ordinary least squares regression analysis with a dichotomous dependent variable (Theil, 1971).

Characteristics of the Welfare Population

Before considering the multivariate results, it is useful to examine the characteristics of the women who will be considered in this research. The tabular results in Appendix Tables A1 through A3 permit comparisons between women and their families who have never and ever received welfare, ever-welfare recipients who received welfare 25 percent or less of the survey years

since leaving home and women who received welfare more than 25 percent of the survey years.[12] In addition, partial comparisons can be made with the group who received welfare in 1978, although the means for many of the variables (which are identical to those included in the forthcoming multivariate analyses) in this instance relate to cross-sectional (1978) characteristics.

On the basis of the tabular results in these appendix tables, it is fair to conclude that women who received welfare in more than 25 percent of the survey years are the most disadvantaged in terms of personal characteristics. In contrast, the least disadvantaged welfare population appears to be those women who received welfare less than 26 percent (but at least one percent) of the survey years. Intermediate between these two categories are women who "ever" received welfare and women who received welfare in 1978. Both of these categories include a proportion of women who have longer term attachment. Also, while not mentioned here in any detail, it is of some importance to note (as may be seen in Appendix Table A3) that, from a cross-sectional perspective, the group of women not receiving welfare in 1978 include relatively large proportions who have received welfare at some time or other since leaving their parents' home--10.5 percent for the white and 38.7 percent for the black non-welfare group in 1978. This observation is consistent with the knowledge that they have socio-demographic characteristics somewhat more congruent with the other welfare groups than do the respondents who have never received welfare.

The women who received welfare in more than 25 percent of the surveys have the least education completed, are most likely to be in poverty, be single or separated but with own children in the household, have a health problem, be black, and come from a background where their parents were in poverty and received welfare. In addition, they were least likely to live in

the south or to be employed. The above results (with the exception of the education, race and the parental background variables) all relate to the proportion of survey years since leaving the parental home that the respondent and her family had the specified characteristics and as such strongly suggest an association between the intensity of welfare use and the continuing prevalence of selected socio-demographic, economic or geographic characteristics. The patterns of the results are generally similar when white and black respondents are considered separately and, although less pronounced, similar results may be seen when comparing these characteristics with the other welfare outcomes.[13]

Most of the above results are not surprising, as they are consistent with commonly held perceptions about the relationships between welfare status and socio-demographic characteristics as well as with the available literature noted earlier. The extent to which some of these characteristics are independent predictors of welfare and are differentially associated with the intensity (as opposed to the incidence) of welfare involvement is considered below.

Determinants of Welfare Receipt in 1978: A Cross-Sectional Analysis

The basic model presented in this section is akin to the multivariate cross-sectional research which has typically been carried out by other researchers. One significant difference, however, between this research and other work (such as that utilizing the PSID) is our specific focus on young women, using a relatively large sample. The PSID research, for example, generally has focused on a sample including all ages and both sexes introducing dummy variables to control for age and sex (Coe, 1981). To the extent that a number of the critical explanatory variables interact with age

and/or sex, the sample used in this study will probably suggest more precisely the primary predictors of cross-sectional welfare access for young women. The rationales for including most of the independent variables in this cross-sectional analysis are for the most part fairly obvious. All the variables in this model are specified and defined in Table 9. Highest grade completed is included partly as a human capital proxy but, in addition, as a possible indicator of a respondent's knowledge of the welfare system. The first of these two interpretations would be consistent with an inverse association between education and welfare; the latter rationale suggests a positive association. The net effect remains unclear.

The poverty status variable is included primarily as a control variable; the intent of this analysis is to consider the association between a number of factors and welfare access independent of the propensity of the family to be in poverty.

A number of marital and family status variables are included because of their inherent importance as predictors of a need for income supplementation. It is anticipated that the presence of children, for women who are never married or separated, widowed or divorced, should be an important determinant of a need for welfare at a particular point in time in comparison with the reference group of women who are married, husband present or never married without children. Also, of course, women in this status are more likely to be eligible to receive A.F.D.C. payments. The welfare need of mothers with husbands present is somewhat more ambiguous, as is the welfare status of separated, widowed or divorced women who do not have children.[14]

After controlling for other status variables, it is hypothesized that women living in the south will have below average probabilities of receiving welfare, given the generally lower level of payments traditionally available

in many southern states. Conversely, it is anticipated that women in metropolitan areas might be more likely to receive welfare because of easier access to welfare sources.

The predicted directions of association between having a health problem or working more extensively and receiving welfare are obvious. Aside from acting as contro , it is of some importance to note whether or not black and white women show similar associations between these two variables and the dependent variable(s). To the extent that there may be differences between the races in the nature and severity of health problems, the health variable may differentially affect the need for welfare assistance. Differences in the employment coefficient may suggest variations in the need or inclination for different categories of women to combine earnings and welfare as components of an overall income package.

The combined race model includes a zero-one dummy variable specifying whether the respondent is white or black. The earlier tabular results clearly indicated a higher level of welfare receipt by black women. The multivariate analysis will clarify whether or not substantial racial differences in welfare receipt remain after controlling for poverty status and other factors which are considered important independent determinants of welfare.[15]

The final two independent variables measure the economic status of the respondent's parental household in the years immediately before the respondent left her parental nome--i.e., whether or not the parental family unit was in poverty or received welfare most of those years. The principal purpose of the parental welfare variable is to test whether any intergenerational transmission of a tendency to be on welfare remains after controlling for other factors (including parental poverty status) associated with welfare.

The dependent variable in this specific model, welfare receipt in 1978,

permits estimation of the determinants of welfare for a typical cross-section of the population at one point in time. This is a fair representation of the population on the welfare rolls in a given year. From a program perspective, it most closely approximates the mix of welfare recipients typically requiring assistance in one calendar year. Table 10 includes comparable models which separately consider the determinants of A.F.D.C., food stamp and other welfare receipt.

The results in Table 9 are partially consistent with expectations.[16] For white women, less education, being separated or never married and having children in the home (in comparison with being single or married without children) and having a health problem predict welfare receipt in 1978. More extensive employment, however, does not have a depressing effect on welfare receipt. Also, there is no significant evidence of a positive connection between coming from a welfare background and receiving welfare oneself.[17]

For the black respondents, the education and family variables show similar associations with welfare receipt in 1978. However, having a health problem, which had been a significant predictor for white women is not significant. Conversely, more extensive employment is strongly predictive of less welfare receipt for black women whereas it was not a significant predictor for white young women.

It is also noteworthy that the parental welfare status variable is predictive of current welfare status for the black respondents. Whether this pattern is generalizable to all categories of welfare recipients will be clarified in subsequent sections. Finally, there is no evidence from the combined race model of any independent effect of race on welfare receipt in 1978 after controlling for all the other factors. On the basis of these results, it is perhaps fair to conclude that while a modest portion of the

difference in welfare receipt between the races reflects differences in the likelihood of white and black women with particular characteristics to be on welfare, the largest part of the racial difference can be attributed to racial differences in socioeconomic or demographic characteristics. In particular, the greater probability that black women will be in poverty, have less education or have children and be head of their own household clearly accounts for a substantial portion of the racial difference in welfare receipt.

Variations in Determinants of Welfare Receipt by Type of Welfare Received

Because the 1978 survey results permitted elaboration of the kind of welfare a respondent received, the determinants of A.F.D.C., food stamps and "other welfare" were separately examined.[18] As was noted earlier, if the two major welfare sources, A.F.D.C. and food stamps are essentially determined by similar characteristics, this research is on firmer ground regarding any generalizations about welfare recipients and possible policy actions.

Table 10 indicates that for a majority of the explanatory variables of interest in this study, the overall cross-sectional model (in Table 9), the A.F.D.C. model and the food stamp model suggest similar patterns of statistical significance. Among the white respondents, education, poverty status and the family status variables are significantly associated with welfare receipt in all three models. The only significant exception is health status, which is not associated with AFDC receipt. This undoubtedly reflects the fact that AFDC receipt is contingent on having children which may be associated with above average health status.

With respect to the black respondents, women with children but without husbands are significantly more likely to receive welfare in general as well as receive food stamps and AFDC. Employment is also inversely associated with

all categories of welfare receipt.

On the other hand, educational attainment and poverty status, which are overall predictors of welfare receipt are not significant predictors of receiving AFDC. They are, however, associated with food stamp receipt.

In contrast, the overall relationship between parental welfare receipt and welfare receipt by the respondents own family unit is solely a reflection of the modest significant association between parental welfare receipt and AFDC receipt by the respondent in 1978. In all likelihood, this association at least partly is due to the fact that women from large families have above average likelihoods of having larger families themselves (Mott and Haurin, 1982).[19] In any event, all of the above suggest that AFDC receipt by black families is perhaps more singularly associated with family dimensions than is true for white families.

It also may be noted for the black women that whereas the health variable shows no overall significant association with welfare receipt in 1978, it does show a marginal association with the "other welfare" dependent variable, the welfare category which includes special assistance to those with particularly serious health problems (e.g., and to the blind and disabled as well as supplementary security income for those in particularly severe economic circumstances). In this regard, having a health problem was also a predictor of "other" welfare receipt for white women. In any event, the above results suggest strong common threads between the various components of the welfare population as well as insights into its heterogeneity. For the most part, the common threads appear sufficiently dominant to warrant an overall examination of the determinants of longer and shorter term welfare receipt.

Finally, it may be noted that the race variable does not attain significance in the combined race version of any of the welfare component

models. Thus, after controlling for the various socioeconomic and demographic factors which may differentiate the black from the white population, no independent effect of race on welfare receipt of any type remains.

Determinants of Ever Having Received Welfare Since Leaving the Parental Home

Whereas the above analyses examined the determinants of an individual receiving welfare at one particular point in time, this logit model considers what are the characteristics of individuals who ever receive welfare. Thus, in this model an individual who, for example, only accesses the welfare rolls once receives a weight equal to that of the individual who is on welfare every survey year.

The model essentially includes as explanatory variables longer term versions of many of the cross-sectional variables included in the 1978 cross-section model. That is, ever having received welfare since leaving the parental home is regressed on a series of variables specifying the proportion of the surveys since leaving home that the respondent was in the various marital/family statuses, in poverty, in a metropolitan area, in the south and so on. In addition, this model includes the same highest grade completed variable and background poverty and welfare variables as the preceding model. The rationales for including these variables in this model are essentially the same as those specified for including the cross-sectional variables in the cross-sectional model. They have been given the additional temporal dimension so that they would coincide temporally with a dependent variable which references all the survey years since leaving home. The variables and model are specified in Table 11.

Examining Table 11, it may be seen for the white respondents that there are a number of similarities in the pattern of association between the

explanatory and dependent variables in the cross-section (1978) and ever-welfare models. Educational attainment is inversely related to ever receiving welfare and to welfare receipt in 1978. Having a child but no husband (whether never married or separated, divorced or widowed) is positively associated with receiving welfare in both models.

It is of some interest to note that southern residence in this model is an important predictor of below average welfare receipt, an association only marginally evidenced in the cross-section. This difference between the cross-sectional and longitudinal models may be a historical artifact; if southern residence was more predictive of below average welfare receipt in earlier years, it could well show up as a predictor in a longitudinal model but not be significant for a more recent cross-section.

Also, employment (in this case being the proportion of surveys in which the respondent worked 26 weeks or more) becomes an important predictor of ever receiving welfare for the white women whereas it was not a predictor of welfare receipt in 1978. Conversely, health, which was a predictor in the cross-section, no longer is significant in this ever-receipt model. It may be recalled that for white women the health factor in the 1978 cross-sectional model partially reflected the importance of health as a predictor of "other" welfare receipt. It may be that young women with short term relatively severe health problems sometimes require special but short-term assistance. However, for women in this age range, this may be a sufficiently rare event that over the long run, it is not a predictor of welfare need for the group as a whole. This will be clarified in the following section in which the association between these variables and the intensity of welfare receipt is considered. Finally, for the white women, it is important to note that, as in the cross-sectional model, there is no evidence of parental welfare receipt

being predictive of a daughter's receiving welfare.

Shifting to the black respondents, it may be seen that the family status variables continue to be important predictors of welfare receipt, as they were in the cross-sectional model. Educational attainment, which had been significant in the cross-section, loses its significance in the ever-welfare model, as do the employment and the parental welfare variables. In contrast, the two geographic variables gain in significance. It is perhaps of some importance to note that the two variables with presumed significant human capital components are not useful predictors of whether or not a black woman ever receives welfare. These two variables were both significant in the white model. Aside from the poverty status variable, it appears that demographic and residence factors are the principal determinants of the black welfare population.

Also, it may be noted that the race variable in the combined race model does obtain significance although its importance is somewhat reduced when the parental background variables are added. Thus, there is some modest support for the thesis that after controlling for other factors, black young women are slightly more likely than their white counterparts to receive welfare at some time. Whether this is generalizable to the population strata which shows a more permanent attachment with the welfare roles will be considered in the following section.

As a final generalization, it appears that human capital based factors are more important predictors of whether or not a white woman ever receives welfare whereas location-specific variables matter more for blacks. For both groups, family-related variables are of major importance as predictors of whether a family unit ever receives welfare assistance.

Who Are the Welfare Repeaters?

In this final analytical section, the focus will be on determining the factors which differentiate those welfare respondents who tend to be repeaters from those who receive welfare less frequently. This is done by estimating (in an ordinary least squares model) the determinants of the proportion of survey years subsequent to leaving one's parents' home that women in the ever-welfare population receive welfare; in other words, which of the welfare recipients tend to receive welfare most frequently. The full models are indicated in Table 12. The independent variables are identical to those in the ever-welfare models.

For the white respondents, with the exception of the educational attainment variable (and the background poverty control variable), there are no differences between the factors which predict ever receiving welfare and frequently receiving welfare. That is, poverty status, the family variables, southern residence and employment operate in a similar manner as predictors of welfare in both models. Conversely, having a health problem or coming from a welfare background are not predictive of the intensity of welfare receipt for white women any more than they predicted ever receiving welfare.

What the above implies is that the population of white women who ever require assistance are essentially similar to those who repeatedly need help. Marital transitions when there are children present are important explanations for why white women may require welfare assistance at some point and why some white women stay on welfare. Employment discontinuities and southern residence apparently have the same impact.

In contrast, limited education is a predictor of a white woman receiving welfare at some time but is not associated with continuing on the welfare rolls. The significant inverse association between education and ever

receiving welfare but lack of association in the welfare intensity models can perhaps be interpreted within the context of our earlier discussion; in the short run, the human capital component of the education variable may be dominant and white women with less schooling may have greater employment difficulties, thus requiring welfare assistance. In the longer run, more education may be associated with a greater knowledge of how the welfare system operates and this might balance out the human capital component of the education-welfare association.

The black model predicting the extensiveness of welfare receipt by the ever welfare population shows several basic similarities with the black ever-welfare model. There are, however, several important differences. As with all the other models, both black and white, the poverty and child status variables continue to be highly significant. As was true with the white women, single parent households require more extensive welfare assistance than their counterparts which do not include children.

Educational attainment and health status are <u>not</u> significant predictors of a need to repeatedly receive welfare. This result essentially parallels that of the ever-welfare black model as well as the white welfare intensity model. It is perhaps now also fair to generalize that health, after controlling for the other factors in the various models (including poverty and employment status) is not a major determinant of welfare receipt in either the short or longer run for black or white young women. The one significant exception to this is the earlier reported evidence that in the cross-section, some women with presumably transient disabilities require temporary disability assistance.

The rationale for the lack of significance for the education variable in both the ever-welfare and welfare intensity models is perhaps similar to that

described above for the white respondents; the inverse associations anticipated for human capital reasons may perhaps be counterbalanced by the knowledge of welfare component with the net result being no association between education and welfare.

The employment variable, which showed no significant association with ever receiving welfare for black women, is, however, an important predictor of frequent welfare use. Whereas short term welfare need for black women and their families is associated most importantly with poverty status per se and family events, longer term involvement is also likely to be partly related to employment or the lack of it. This suggests that direct employment-related assistance can be an important deterrent to continuing welfare dependency existence, perhaps even more so for black than for white respondents.

Of course, over-riding all of these factors is the dominant thread of poverty which cuts across short and longer term welfare use. Although the poverty dimension certainly interacts in significant ways with many of the other predictive factors, the overall predictive power of all the welfare models is heavily determined by the poverty status dimension.

One additional significant finding in this final model is the importance of welfare background as a determinant of intensity of welfare utilization for the black respondents. The significant association between the welfare background variable and welfare receipt in the black cross-sectional model apparently reflects this association between the background variable and the group which shows a more permanent attachment with the welfare rolls. It may be recalled that this welfare background variable was not significant in the black ever-welfare model. For this racial group, short term welfare is associated with demographics; longer term attachment does appear to have a more permanent connotation, being associated not only with demographics and

longer term employment attachment but also with a tendency to have come from a background which included welfare as part of the family income package. It should also be recalled that the demographic component undoubtedly reflected an above average propensity for both the mother's and daughter's generation to require AFDC assistance because of above average fertility.

Finally, it had been noted earlier in the tabular longitudinal analysis that black women on the welfare rolls were much more likely to repeatedly receive welfare than their white counterparts. However, in contrast with the pattern evidenced in the ever-welfare model, the insignificant race coefficient in the total race model in Table 12 suggests strongly that the difference in the intensity of welfare utilization between the races reflects differences between white and black women in other income and earnings availability, demographics, employability and family background factors. Thus, if there is a normative component in the racial difference in "willingness" to repeatedly go on welfare, the evidence is, at best, ambiguous. From an intra-generational perspective, there is marginal evidence in support of a greater tendency for black families to ever receive welfare, but there is no apparent racial difference in the propensity to repeatedly receive welfare--the dimension of welfare most commonly considered when the issue of continuing welfare attachment is raised. However, there is some cross-generational evidence of a racial difference as parental welfare attachment does appear to translate into an above average propensity for the children's generation to repeatedly access welfare among black but not among white families.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Data from the National Longitudinal Surveys document clearly that much of the increase during the 1970s in the propensity of young women and their families to be on welfare reflects the greater likelihood that women with children will seek assistance. This increasing tendency to be on the welfare rolls paralleled declines in the probability of the same group to be residing in poverty. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the decade of the 1970s witnessed fundamental changes in the relationship between poverty status and welfare status. This transition undoubtedly reflected both the loosening of welfare regulations as well as a greater normative acceptance, by families of both races, of the appropriateness of seeking welfare and being aware of welfare sources when in financial need.

In this regard, the importance of employment as a mechanism for getting and staying out of poverty and off the welfare rolls cannot be underestimated. For families with employed mothers, the percent in poverty declined over the decade whereas the poverty rate for families where the mother was not employed rose substantially. Concurrently with this trend in the employment-poverty association, sharp increases appeared in the percent of non-employed mothers seeking welfare, but only modest increases were evidenced among employed mothers.

Aside from the apparent direct effect which employment can have on reducing poverty and the need for welfare, the results certainly support the notion that substantial numbers of families use a variety of income sources to stay above the poverty line. Overall, 56 percent of 25 to 29 year old mothers in 1978 who were not in poverty but were on welfare were employed. Only 6 percent of their counterparts in poverty were employed, further evidence of

the importance of employment in helping to raise families above subsistence. Conversely, these same statistics show that welfare, by itself, certainly does not significantly alleviate poverty. It is, however, an important income supplement which permits many families to avoid severe economic hardship.

The longitudinal dimension of the NLS data clearly shows the different conclusions which can be drawn using cross-sectional and longitudinal perspectives. About 7 percent of white and 31 percent of black women received welfare payments at some time during the year preceeding the 1978 survey. However, fully 1 of every 5 white and 2 of every 3 black young women and their families had a need for welfare at some point between 1968 and 1980. In addition, some of those women who used the welfare system required only brief assistance whereas others required continuing assistance. Various motivations lie behind these varying patterns: many families need assistance only to help with temporary crises; others, for a variety of reasons, are unable to cope over more extended time periods without help. This study strongly suggests that if a permanent welfare status is to be avoided, the cycles of dependence must be disrupted quickly. Once a family has been on the welfare rolls for two consecutive surveys, their probability of leaving the rolls on subsequent surveys is slight. Thus, if the causes of being on welfare are not quickly remedied, the likelihood is that a welfare recipient will remain on the rolls for a long time. From a program perspective, intervention earlier in the welfare "cycle" probably has a greater chance of having an impact. In particular, maximum payoff is likely if job-related assistance is proferred during the first year an individual (and her family) appears on welfare.

The longitudinal analyses also show the heterogeneity of this welfare population. For white women, demographics and employment inadequacy appear to be important predictors of needing both short and longer term assistance.

Employment assistance probably represents a critical mechanism for avoiding longer-term welfare dependency.

For black women, the relevance of demographics, particularly the presence of small children and the absence of a husband, are equally pervading as likely determinants of both shorter and longer term welfare attachment--independent of income level and other related characteristics. Also, perhaps even more than for whites, employment is a key program dimension if young black families are to move above the poverty line and off the welfare rolls.

Regarding the issue of whether or not there is a welfare class, the results are consistent with the notion that background can, in some instances, have a modest direct effect on welfare propensities. For black families, the results are somewhat suggestive that families with more enduring associations with the welfare system are indeed partly maintaining these ties because of childhood and early adult family influences. This influence may to a considerable degree reflect the likelihood that black women from large families are more likely to have more children themselves and to have them at an earlier age. Also, from a within-generation perspective there is modest evidence that black women are more likely to ever receive welfare than their white counterparts after controlling for the various other factors considered to be important predictors of welfare. There is, however, no longer-term racial distinction as race is not an independent predictor of longer-term welfare attachment.

If there is any evidence in support of a "welfare class," it reflects a tendency to pass certain orientations across generations, with no evidence supporting the idea that young blacks are more likely because of their own motivations to repeatedly require welfare assistance. Indeed, in the overall scheme of things, the significant parental welfare variable in the black

welfare intensity model represents a trivial effect in comparison with the cumulative impact of all the other factors. It is useful to emphasize a final time that the reasons more young black families are on welfare are because they are poorer, have more employment difficulties and in some instances have different family circumstances. Black families in particular circumstances are not more likely than their comparably circumstanced white counterparts to repeatedly receive assistance.

Finally, it is useful to reiterate the importance of longitudinal in comparison with cross-sectional perspectives in evaluating program needs. Whereas the one-point-in-time welfare roll cross-section overstates the importance of the hard core welfare population in relation to a longitudinal mix of individuals who ever received welfare, it underrepresents the hard core population when considered from the viewpoint of a longer term mix of welfare cases. As has been demonstrated, hard core welfare recipients in actuality represent a relatively high proportion of the total rolls over an extended time period. To the extent that all welfare clients receive similar services, resources may not be allocated as effectively as they might be. The nature of the vocational and training assistance needed by the young women who have been on welfare a longer time period may differ considerably from the welfare transient. In any event, it needs to be emphasized that even the longer term recipient in this population is a young woman. To maintain her indefinitely on the welfare rolls with no significant effort being made to alleviate the causes for her welfare attachment is a disservice both to her and to the larger society.

Footnotes

[1]The original sample of 5,159 women 14 to 24 in 1968 had been reduced by attrition to about 3,500 by 1980. There is evidence of some modest attrition bias over that period selective of less educated respondents who in all likelihood would have had above average welfare access probabilities (Mott, 1982). Thus, the welfare statistics in this study may represent slight understatements of welfare probabilities over the period. There is no particular reason, however, to anticipate any biases in the multivariate analyses included in this study. Also, see Center for Human Resource Research, 1982 for more a detailed description of the young women's NLS data set.

[2]There is a parallel literature which focuses in an analogous manner on the association between poverty incidence over time, which draws similar conclusions. See for example Bumpass and Sweet, 1981; Hill, 1981; Coe, 1978.

[3]See Valentine (1968) for a comprehensive statement of the philosophical approaches which have been brought to bear on this issue.

[4]Reported welfare receipt levels for 1980 are significantly lower than in 1978 and suggest a discontinuity inconsistent with evidence from other sources. Partly for this reason, the more comprehensive welfare statistics from the 1978 survey are used for trend analysis as well as for the multivariate cross-sectional analyses below.

[5]Some of the apparent incongruity between the welfare and poverty percentages may reflect definitional problems. Poverty status references whether or not the income of the family unit during the preceding year was above or below the poverty line (footnote 11 describes the poverty definition in somewhat greater detail). On the other hand, if the respondent's family received welfare at any time during the preceding year they are reported here as receiving welfare. Thus, there can be families whose overall family income for the year put them above the poverty level even though they may have been in poverty and receiving welfare at some time during the year.

[6]It should be noted that the years since 1978 have witnessed declines in the real value of the average A.F.D.C. payment per recipient and some leveling off in case loads (Newspaper Enterprise Association, 1982, p. 217). The discussion here focuses on the peak growth years of welfare recipiency which occurred during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

[7]See, for example, Chapter 8 of Moore and Brent (1982), for an extensive discussion of how A.F.D.C. coverage varies between the states.

[8]As already mentioned, this included interviews each year between 1968 and 1973, 1975, 1977, 1978 and 1980. Thus, there are three (approximate) calendar years (1973, 1975 and 1978) for which welfare data were not available, reflecting the fact that the information was typically collected for the twelve months preceding the survey date and the interviews were completed during the first few months of the years specified above. In my estimation, the only potentially significant substantive bias implied by the above is that

transition probabilities for staying on welfare from one survey to the next will understate actual annual transition probabilities for the three survey intervals which included two calendar years (1973-1975, 1975-1977 and 1978-1980).

[9]As indicated in footnote 8, there are three years in the 13 year period for which information is not available. Thus, the ever welfare statistics in the most technical sense should be interpreted as "ever received welfare during ten years within a thirteen year period," and the welfare transition probabilities are in all likelihood slight understatements of actual year to year transition probabilitites. Also, for all except the last two surveys, welfare access implies welfare access by the family unit. In the last two surveys, it means welfare access by respondent or spouse. For ease of presentation, the text will frequently be couched in terms such as "respondent's access to welfare over the period" even though the above caveats apply.

[10]If the respondent only lived with her parents in 1968, a value of 1 on the variable meant the family received welfare that year. If she lived with them in 1968 and 1969, a value of 1 implied welfare receipt at least one of the two years. If she lived with her parents through 1970, a value of 1 meant welfare was received at least two of the three years; similarly, residence with her parents through 1971 required welfare receipt at least 2 of the 4 years and residence through 1972 at least 3 of the 5 years in order to receive a code of 1 on the welfare variable. Otherwise the respondent was coded zero on this variable.

[11]The official poverty definition is based on the relationship between the family's income level, the number of family members, and whether or not they are living in an urban or rural area in the relevant year. See, for example, the following U.S. Bureau of the Census publications: All in the Current Population Report series, "The Extent of Poverty in the United States, 1959 to 1966," P-60, No. 54, and "Revision in Poverty Statistics, 1959 and 1968," P-23, No. 28, and "Characteristics in the Low Income Population, 1971," P-60, No. 86.

[12]The separate categorization of the women into the latter two groups was admittedly made on pragmatic grounds. It allocates reasonably large numbers to both categories.

[13]While not specified in the appendix tables, a comparison of the characteristics of women who received A.F.D.C. or food stamps in the year preceding the 1978 survey was also made. The characteristics of women receiving A.F.D.C. or food stamps were similar, except for the following: A.F.D.C. women were slightly more likely to have children but no husband, which is not surprising given the stated objective of the A.F.D.C. program. Also, A.F.D.C. women were less likely to have a health problem, perhaps consistent with the fact that they are more likely to have borne children.

[14]The author acknowledges that the causal association between marital status and welfare can be quite complex. Women without husbands may have above average need to access welfare. Conversely, at least in some instances, husbands may leave a household in order to enhance the probability that the wife and children are eligible for welfare. Resolution of this issue is

beyond the scope of this research.

[15]As already indicated in the preceding footnote, there are a number of causal issues whose resolution is beyond the scope of this research. The association between employment and welfare is one important case in point. A particular individual might chose to work less because of the knowledge that welfare is available. This writer believes, however, that the dominant causal direction is the opposite. Women unable to obtain adequate employment will in some instances be obligated to access welfare in order to maintain even a minimal subsistence level of existence. If this supposition is correct, the inclusion of weeks worked as an independent variable is not only legitimate but necessary if the model is to be properly specified.

Obviously there are also important causal associations between employment and poverty status. With the employment variable removed from the analysis, the poverty variable, not surprisingly, increases modestly in size.

[16]The analysis will focus on the models which include the parental poverty and welfare variables.

[17]To the extent that welfare was being received in both the parental and (subsequently) respondents' households because of the welfare assistance being provided for the child of the respondent, cross-generational welfare propensities reported in this research may be overstated.

[18]The results in the "other" welfare model should be interpreted cautiously given the small number of respondents in this category. Several independent variables were deleted from this model (and from the AFDC model) in order to obtain model convergence. This was because one category in these dummy independent variables showed total symmetry (or lack of symmetry) with the dependent variable. Statistically, the deletion of such variables does not affect the results for the other variables in the model.

[19]The reader might question this interpretation as only the black parental welfare variable attains significance in the AFDC model. In this regard, it may be of interest to note that the black and white coefficients are about equal in magnitude.

References

Barr, N.A. and R.E. Hall. 1981. "The Probability of Dependence on Public Assistance. Econometrica 48: 109-123.

Boskin, Michael J. and Frederick C. Nold. 1975. "A Markov Model of Turnover in Aid to Families with Dependent Children." Journal of Human Resources 10: 467-481.

Bumpass, Larry L. and James Sweet. 1981. "A Demographic Perspective on the Poverty Population." Discussion paper DP669-81. Institute for Research on Poverty. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Center for Human Resource Research. 1982. The National Longitudinal Surveys Handbook 1982. Columbus: The Ohio State University.

Coe, Richard D. 1981. "A Preliminary Empirical Examination of the Dynamics of Welfare Use" in Martha S. Hill, et al. (eds.) Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress 9. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Coe, Richard D. 1979. "An Examination of the Dynamics of Food Stamp Use" in Greg J. Duncan and James N. Morgan (eds.) Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress 7. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Coe, Richard. 1978. "Dependency and Poverty in the Short and Long Run" in Greg J. Duncan and James N. Morgan (eds.) Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress 6. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Duvall, Henrietta J., Karen W. Goudreau and Robert E. Marsh. 1982. "Aid to Families With Dependent Children: Characteristics of Recipients in 1979." Social Security Bulletin 45: 3.

Frazier, E. Franklin. 1966. The Negro Family in the United States. Revised and abridged edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goodwin, Leonard. 1972. Do the Poor Want to Work. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Greenleigh Associates, Inc. 1969. A Pilot Study of Intergenerational Dependency in New York City (mimeo). New York.

Haggstrom, Gus W., Thomas J. Blaschke, David E. Kanouse, William Lisowski, and Peter Morrison. 1981. Teenage Parents: Their Ambitions and Attainments. Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand Corporation.

Harrison, Bennett. 1977. Labor Market Structure and the Relationship Between Work and Welfare. Department of Urban Studies and Planning (mimeo). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Hill, Martha S. 1981. "Some Dynamic Aspects of Poverty" in Martha S. Hill,

et al. (eds.) Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress 9. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Levitan, Sar A, Martin Rein and David Marwick. 1972. Work and Welfare Go Together. Policy Studies in Employment and Welfare Number 13. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lyon, David W. 1976. The Dynamics of Welfare Dependency: A Survey. The Rand Paper Series (mimeo). Santa Monica, Cal.: Rand.

Meyers, Samuel M. and Jennie McIntyre. 1969. Welfare Policy and Its Consequences for the Recipient Population: A Study of the AFDC Program. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Moore, Kristin A. and Martha R. Brent. 1982. Private Crisis, Public Cost, Policy Perspectives on Teenage Childbearing. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Mott, Frank L. 1982. "Women: The Employment Revolution" in Frank L. Mott (ed.) The Employment Revolution. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Mott, Frank L. and R. Jean Haurin. 1982. "Being an Only Child: Effects on Educational Progressions and Career Orientations." Journal of Family Issues 3: 575-593.

Mott, Frank L. and Nan L. Maxwell. 1981. "School Age Mothers: 1968 and 1979." Family Planning Perspectives 13: 287-292.

Mott, Frank L. and David Shapiro. 1983. Trends in the Employment of Young Women: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Surveys. Special Report. Center for Human Resource Research. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1965. The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor.

Newspaper Enterprise Association. 1982. The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1983. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc.

Rein, Martin and Lee Rainwater. 1978. "Patterns of Welfare Use." Social Service Review 52: 511-534.

Ross, Heather L. and Isabel V. Sawhill. 1975. Time of Transition. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Rossi, Peter H. and Zahava D. Blum. 1968. "Class, Status and Poverty." Report No. 15 (mimeo). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University.

Schiller, Bradley R. 1973. "Empirical Studies of Welfare Dependency: A Survey." Journal of Human Resources 8 (Supplement): 19-32.

Theil, H. 1971. Principles of Econometrics. New York: John Wiley.

Valentine, Charles A. 1968. Culture and Poverty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wiseman, Michael. 1976. "Change and Turnover In a Welfare Population." Working Paper No. 70, Income Dynamics Project, Department of Economics (mimeo). Berkeley: University of California.

Table 1 Distribution of Young Women by Residence, Parenthood Status and Race: 1968, 1973 and 1978

	1968			1973			1978		
	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black
All respondents	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Living with parents-no children	58.9	59.8	50.8	17.7	17.7	16.8	4.6	4.3	6.9
Living with parents-children	2.8	1.6	11.7	2.9	1.7	11.7	2.8	2.0	9.1
Living in own household-no children	18.3	18.7	15.9	30.1	31.8	17.1	24.4	25.7	14.4
Living in own household-children	20.1	19.9	21.6	49.4	48.8	54.4	68.1	68.0	69.6

Table 2 Welfare and Poverty Status for Young Women by Residence, Parenthood Status and Race: 1968, 1973 and 1978

	1968			1973			1978		
	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black
All respondents	(3408)	(2492)	(877)	(3408)	(2492)	(877)	(3408)	(2492)	(877)
% in poverty	14.5	9.8	51.1	10.5	7.3	36.1	8.5	5.8	30.3
% on welfare	4.6	2.5	21.0	8.0	5.3	29.8	9.7	7.0	31.3
Has own children	(851)	(556)	(287)	(1885)	(1291)	(576)	(2481)	(1762)	(696)
% in poverty	15.4	8.5	49.0	13.1	8.7	40.4	9.9	6.3	34.6
% on welfare	7.4	4.3	21.9	11.6	7.9	34.1	12.0	8.7	35.9
Has no children	(2557)	(1936)	(590)	(1523)	(1201)	(301)	(927)	(730)	(181)
% in poverty	14.2	10.1	51.9	7.6	5.8	27.4	5.4	4.7	13.7
% on welfare	3.8	2.0	20.6	4.1	2.6	21.4	4.0	3.1	14.3
Respondents living with parents	(2098)	(1516)	(554)	(723)	(461)	(251)	(299)	(155)	(137)
% in poverty	14.2	8.6	56.3	12.0	4.9	48.5	12.0	5.2	33.2
% on welfare	5.0	2.4	24.5	9.9	5.4	34.8	12.4	8.5	25.3
Has own children	(133)	-	-	(144)	-	-	(128)	-	-
% in poverty	36.6			42.6			16.4		
% on welfare	21.3			30.8			18.5		
Has no children	(1965)	-	-	(579)	-	-	(171)	-	-
% in poverty	13.1			7.8			9.3		
% on welfare	4.2			6.5			8.7		
Respondents in own household	(1310)	(976)	(323)	(2685)	(2031)	(626)	(3109)	(2337)	(740)
% in poverty	15.0	11.6	41.9	10.1	7.8	31.2	8.2	5.8	29.7
% on welfare	4.0	2.7	15.3	7.5	5.2	27.8	9.5	6.9	32.4
Has own children	(718)	(513)	(198)	(1741)	(1244)	(480)	(2353)	(1711)	(620)
% in poverty	12.5	8.0	45.1	11.7	8.3	36.1	9.6	6.4	33.4
% on welfare	5.5	4.1	15.4	10.5	7.5	31.5	11.8	8.6	36.0
Has no children	(592)	(463)	(125)	(944)	(787)	(146)	(757)	(626)	(120)
% in poverty	17.6	15.5	37.4	7.5	7.1	14.6	4.6	4.2	10.9
% on welfare	2.4	1.1	15.1	2.6	1.7	16.0	3.1	2.3	14.9

Sample: Respondents who were interviewed in all survey years between 1968 and 1980. Sample sizes in parentheses.

Table 3 Percent of Families in Poverty Receiving Welfare by Residence, Parenthood Status and Race: 1968 and 1978

	Total		White		Black	
	1968	1978	1968	1978	1968	1978
All respondents in poverty	22.4	57.3	15.8	46.1	32.0	74.5
With children	26.5	65.2	21.3	54.0	29.1	79.6
Without children	21.1	22.8	14.6	22.3	33.3	24.8
Living with parents	28.2	41.0	21.4	17.1	36.0	53.9
Not living with parents	13.3	59.3	9.2	48.0	22.9	78.9
With children	22.6	65.5	21.3	54.2	24.6	82.2
Without children	6.0	24.4	2.4	23.7	20.0	28.5

Table 4 Percent on Welfare and Percent in Poverty by Parenthood Status and Employment Status: 1968, 1973 and 1978

	Age 20-24						Age 25-29					
	1968			1973			1973			1978		
	Total	Children	No children	Total	Children	No children	Total	Children	No children	Total	Children	No children
All respondents	(1249)	(578)	(671)	(1570)	(683)	(887)	(1252)	(931)	(321)	(1459)	(952)	(507)
% receiving welfare	4.1	6.9	2.1	8.5	16.6	3.2	7.3	8.1	5.1	9.7	14.1	2.7
% in poverty	10.8	14.0	8.5	11.6	16.8	8.2	8.9	10.0	6.1	8.1	10.5	4.2
Employed	(655)	(194)	(461)	(929)	(300)	(629)	(648)	(394)	(257)	(929)	(495)	(434)
% receiving welfare	2.4	6.9	0.9	3.8	10.3	1.5	4.3	5.7	2.3	4.8	9.2	0.9
% in poverty	7.7	13.6	5.7	7.0	9.2	6.3	5.2	7.7	1.7	3.5	3.9	3.2
Not employed	(594)	(384)	(210)	(641)	(383)	(258)	(604)	(537)	(67)	(530)	(457)	(73)
% receiving welfare	6.1	6.9	4.7	15.7	21.2	8.2	10.6	9.8	17.4	18.3	19.0	14.1
% in poverty	14.5	14.2	14.9	18.6	22.4	13.4	13.0	11.5	25.1	16.2	17.2	10.2

Note: Sample sizes in parentheses.

Table 5 Trends in Selected Employment Characteristics by Poverty Status and Welfare Status: 1968, 1973 and 1978

	1968			1973			1978		
	Labor force part. rate	Percent employed	Mean weeks worked	labor force part. rate	Percent employed	Mean weeks worked	Labor force part. rate	Percent employed	Mean weeks worked
All women									
20-24 years old									
All respondents	58.1	51.9	26.3	65.0	60.2	25.9	-	-	-
Respondents in poverty	47.5	37.0	16.6	51.0	37.5	14.1	-	-	-
Respondents on welfare	36.9	29.1	15.6	41.6	27.1	10.8	-	-	-
Respondents in poverty and on welfare	39.4	30.8	16.6	42.0	24.8	8.7	-	-	-
Respondents not in poverty but on welfare	38.4	30.1	15.9	43.9	31.6	14.5	-	-	-
25-29 years old									
All respondents	-	-	-	54.0	51.1	21.3	68.8	64.1	23.8
Respondents in poverty	-	-	-	37.0	29.8	12.2	41.8	27.8	10.3
Respondents on welfare	-	-	-	40.7	31.4	13.1	47.7	35.0	14.7
Respondents in poverty and on welfare	-	-	-	38.6	25.5	11.4	28.3	9.3	7.3
Respondents not in poverty but on welfare	-	-	-	41.9	36.6	13.1	58.2	51.2	20.8
Women with children									
20-24 years old									
All respondents	36.0	30.1	14.7	47.8	41.3	17.1	-	-	-
Respondents in poverty	38.4	29.7	13.6	39.8	22.9	8.4	-	-	-
Respondents on welfare	36.4	30.0	15.2	41.1	24.7	9.4	-	-	-
Respondents in poverty and on welfare	40.0	32.4	17.9	39.1	20.1	6.6	-	-	-
Respondents not in poverty but on welfare	34.8	28.8	13.3	53.1	37.1	15.5	-	-	-
25-29 years old									
All respondents	-	-	-	42.8	40.3	16.2	55.5	50.5	18.5
Respondents in poverty	-	-	-	37.9	31.6	12.4	32.6	18.2	7.9
Respondents on welfare	-	-	-	39.0	30.7	12.8	46.4	32.5	13.3
Respondents in poverty and on welfare	-	-	-	38.5	27.6	12.2	24.5	5.8	5.4
Respondents not in poverty but on welfare	-	-	-	35.6	30.0	11.4	64.2	56.2	22.8

Table 6 Distribution of Women "Ever" Receiving Welfare by Number of Surveys Reporting Welfare and Race

(Percentage distribution)

	White	Black
Total	100	100
One survey	49	21
Two surveys	16	15
Three surveys	12	13
Four surveys	7	11
Five surveys	5	8
Six surveys	5	7
Seven surveys	2	8
Eight surveys	1	7
Nine surveys	2	5
Ten surveys	1	4

Table 7 Distribution of Total Welfare Occurrences Over the Ten Survey Period in Relation to Number of Surveys Respondent Reports Welfare Receipt by Race

	White	Black
Single occurrence	.20	.05
Two occurrences	.13	.07
Three occurrences	.14	.10
Four occurrences	.11	.10
Five occurrences	.10	.10
Six occurrences	.12	.10
Seven occurrences	.05	.13
Eight occurrences	.04	.14
Nine occurrences	.06	.12
Ten occurrences	.05	.09

Table 8 Welfare Transition Probabilities by Race

	White		Black	
Probability of remaining on welfare				
2 surveys if on welfare one survey	.40	(597)[a]	.59	(830)
3 surveys if on welfare 2 successive surveys	.67	(212)	.77	(435)
4 surveys if on welfare 3 successive surveys	.67	(125)	.73	(314)
5 surveys if on welfare 4 successive surveys	.83	(68)	.77	(216)
6 surveys if on welfare 5 successive surveys	.70	(54)	.85	(154)
7 surveys if on welfare 6 successive surveys	.84	(26)	.77	(117)
8 surveys if on welfare 7 successive surveys	.76	(21)	.84	(70)
9 surveys if on welfare 8 successive surveys	.91	(11)	.83	(46)
10 surveys if on welfare 9 successive surveys	-		.92	(26)

[a]Sample sizes in parentheses.

Table 9 Determinants of Receiving Welfare in 1978: Logit Coefficients

(asymptotic t-ratios in parentheses)

	Total		White		Black	
Highest grade completed	-0.401[d]	-0.376[d]	-0.430[d]	-0.405[d]	-0.378[e]	-0.395[e]
	(4.83)	(4.54)	(4.29)	(4.02)	(2.17)	(2.05)
Ratio of family income to poverty threshold	-0.006[a]	-0.006[a]	-0.010[a]	-0.010[a]	-0.005[a]	-0.005[a]
	(4.22)	(4.35)	(4.12)	(4.16)	(2.79)	(2.72)
Never married with children	2.068[a]	2.122[a]	2.356[b]	2.574[b]	2.162[c]	2.022[c]
	(3.02)	(3.01)	(1.82)	(1.90)	(1.60)	(1.36)
Married, husband present with children	-1.807[d]	-1.752[d]	-0.897	-0.882	-3.627[e]	-3.456[e]
	(3.26)	(3.09)	(1.31)	(1.28)	(2.55)	(2.23)
Separated/widowed/divorced with children	1.894[a]	1.985[a]	1.475[b]	1.614[b]	1.997[c]	1.981[c]
	(3.17)	(3.27)	(2.05)	(2.24)	(1.44)	(1.31)
Separated/widowed/divorced without children	0.103	0.200	-0.438	-0.154	1.208	1.219
	(0.12)	(0.23)	(0.43)	(0.15)	(0.47)	(0.54)
Race (black = 1)	0.854[e]	0.381	-	-	-	-
	(2.48)	(0.97)				
Living in metropolitan area	-0.427	-0.371	-0.266	-0.186	-1.127	-1.260
	(1.22)	(1.05)	(0.64)	(0.44)	(1.50)	(1.50)
Living in South	-0.399	-0.392	-0.621	-0.693[c]	0.057	0.216
	(1.14)	(1.09)	(1.27)	(1.41)	(0.09)	(0.32)
Had health problem	0.772[b]	0.791[b]	1.391[a]	1.301[a]	-1.229	-1.181
	(1.81)	(1.84)	(2.79)	(2.58)	(1.02)	(0.92)
Number of weeks worked in year	-0.047[a]	-0.044[a]	-0.003	-0.002	-0.108[a]	-0.104[a]
	(5.32)	(5.10)	(0.24)	(0.19)	(5.22)	(5.08)
Received welfare most years with parents	-	0.555[c]	-	-1.176	-	1.223[b]
		(1.30)		(1.26)		(1.99)
In poverty most years with parents	-	0.648[c]	-	0.951[c]	-	-0.036
		(1.62)		(1.63)		(0.05)
Constant	5.444	4.845	5.205	4.747	8.717	8.255
N	1021	1021	798	798	223	223

NOTE: Universe = (1) must reside with parents in 1968, (2) must have left parents by 1973 and (3) interviewed all surveys 1968-1980. All of the independent variables (with the exception of highest grade completed, poverty status and weeks worked) are coded 1 if respondent is in specified status and zero otherwise.

[a]One-tailed significance at .01 level.
[b]One-tailed significance at .05 level.
[c]One-tailed significance at .10 level.
[d]Two-tailed significance at .01 level.
[e]Two-tailed significance at .05 level.
[f]Two-tailed significance at .10 level.

Table 10 Determinants of Receiving Welfare in 1978 By Welfare Type: Logit Coefficients

(asymptotic t values in parentheses)

	AFDC			Food stamps			Other		
	Total race	White	Black	Total race	White	Black	Total race	White	Black
Highest grade completed	-0.074	-0.247[e]	0.247	-0.328[d]	-0.321[d]	-0.429[e]	-0.206[e]	-0.205	-0.384
	(0.77)	(2.28)	(1.59)	(4.02)	(3.20)	(2.32)	(2.25)	(1.53)	(1.77)
Ratio of family income to poverty threshold	-0.004[a]	-0.011[a]	-0.002	-0.005[a]	-0.012[a]	-0.002[c]	-0.003[b]	-0.014[a]	-0.001
	(2.76)	(2.95)	(1.17)	(3.61)	(4.06)	(1.34)	(1.66)	(3.51)	(0.42)
Never married, with children	4.410[a]	(2)	3.339[a]	2.290[a]	2.530[b]	2.761[b]	1.858[a]	(2)	0.896
	(3.84)		(2.64)	(2.99)	(1.85)	(2.04)	(2.54)		(0.89)
Married, husband present, with children	-0.163	(2)	-1.692	-1.153[f]	-1.050	-1.107	(2)	(2)	(2)
	(0.14)		(1.14)	(1.78)	(1.32)	(0.80)			
Separated/widowed/ divorced with children	3.809[a]	2.313[a]	3.115[a]	2.321[a]	1.323[a]	3.293[a]	2.152[a]	0.961[c]	1.527[c]
	(3.48)	(3.15)	(2.46)	(3.36)	(1.61)	(2.41)	(3.64)	(1.28)	(1.52)
Separated/widowed/ divorced without children	(2)	(2)	(2)	0.662	-0.647	3.427[f]	2.504[d]	0.537	4.858[d]
				(0.71)	(0.57)	(1.70)	(3.43)	(0.48)	(2.66)
Race (black = 1)	0.156	-	-	0.489	-	-	-0.157	-	-
	(0.28)			(1.18)			(0.27)		
Living in metropolitan area	-0.867	-0.246	-1.866	0.007	0.245	-0.426	-0.166	-0.701	(2)
	(1.70)	(0.43)	(1.96)	(0.02)	(0.51)	(0.52)	(0.33)	(1.14)	
Living in South	-0.589	(2)	0.527	-0.240	-0.880[c]	0.944[c]	-0.667	0.306	-2.399[b]
	(1.20)		(0.81)	(0.64)	(1.55)	(1.44)	(1.26)	(0.46)	(2.00)
Had health problem	-0.728	0.069	-0.881	0.572	1.075[b]	-0.937	1.445[a]	2.253[a]	1.452[c]
	(1.13)	(0.08)	(0.97)	(1.25)	(1.91)	(0.88)	(3.03)	(3.34)	(1.41)
Number of weeks worked in past year	-0.050[a]	-0.017	-0.076[a]	-0.046[a]	-0.010	-0.084[a]	-0.009	0.049	-0.067[a]
	(4.76)	(1.09)	(4.32)	(5.21)	(0.78)	(5.37)	(0.85)	(2.79)	(2.45)
Received welfare most years with parents	0.595	0.994	1.058[c]	0.126	-0.771	0.485	0.096	(2)	0.628
	(1.08)	(1.02)	(1.60)	(0.28)	(0.80)	(0.83)	(0.17)		(0.72)
In poverty most years with parents	0.253	0.188	-0.775	0.534	0.931[c]	-0.266	1.129[b]	0.837	1.371[c]
	(0.46)	(0.21)	(1.08)	(1.27)	(1.41)	(0.42)	(2.07)	(0.99)	(1.34)
Constant	-1.199	1.508	-2.788	3.141	3.808	4.891	-1.322	-0.405	1.013
N	1021	798	223	1021	798	223	1021	798	223

1. NOTE: See Table 9 for statistical significance glossary and universe specification.
2. Variable excluded from this model for statistical reasons. See footnote 19.

Table 11 Determinants of Ever Receiving Welfare in Any Survey Year Since Leaving Parental Home: Logit Coefficients

(asymptotic t ratios in parentheses)[1]

	Total		White		Black	
Highest grade completed	-0.233[d]	-0.220[d]	-0.246[d]	-0.224[d]	-0.211[f]	-0.189
	(4.46)	(4.19)	(4.08)	(3.70)	(1.86)	(1.59)
% of surveys living in poverty	5.656[a]	5.548[a]	5.304[a]	5.177[a]	7.194[a]	7.459[a]
	(8.55)	(8.30)	(6.55)	(6.29)	(5.46)	(5.44)
% of surveys never married with own children	3.185[a]	3.185[a]	6.720[b]	6.527[b]	2.220[a]	2.039[b]
	(4.29)	(4.21)	(2.01)	(1.95)	(2.49)	(2.23)
% of surveys married, spouse present with children	0.647[f]	0.323[f]	0.642	0.626	0.468	0.487
	(1.80)	(1.81)	(1.51)	(1.48)	(0.67)	(0.69)
% of surveys separated, divorced, widowed, with children	3.200[a]	3.246[a]	3.627[a]	3.703[a]	1.989[b]	1.867[b]
	(5.71)	(5.75)	(5.22)	(5.31)	(2.04)	(1.90)
% of surveys separated, divorced, widowed, without children	1.436	1.452	1.708	1.797[f]	0.695	0.342
	(1.51)	(1.54)	(1.56)	(1.68)	(0.34)	(0.17)
Race (black = 1)	0.848[a]	0.623[b]	-	-	-	-
	(3.50)	(2.26)				
% of surveys in metropolitan area	0.018	0.044	-0.184	-0.159	0.838[c]	0.794[c]
	(0.08)	(0.18)	(0.69)	(0.59)	(1.46)	(1.37)
% of surveys in South	-0.828[a]	-0.829[a]	-0.813[a]	-0.859[a]	-0.901[b]	-0.821[b]
	(3.52)	(3.47)	(2.86)	(2.97)	(2.08)	(1.83)
% of surveys with health problem	0.211	0.247	-0.237	-0.135	1.716[c]	1.819[c]
	(0.35)	(0.41)	(0.33)	(0.19)	(1.35)	(1.43)
% of surveys worked 26 weeks or more	-0.856[a]	-0.820[b]	-0.969[b]	-0.898[b]	0.179	-0.134
	(2.35)	(2.25)	(2.27)	(2.10)	(0.23)	(0.18)
Received welfare most years with parents	-	0.314	-	0.159	-	0.538
		(0.94)		(0.29)		(1.15)
In poverty most years with parents	-	0.316	-	0.782[b]	-	-0.401
		(1.10)		(2.12)		(0.89)
Constant	0.754	0.511	1.121	0.719	0.342	0.058
N	1192	1192	936	936	256	256

NOTE: Universe = (1) must reside with parents in 1968, (2) must have left parents by 1973 and (3) interviewed all surveys 1968-1980. All of the independent variables (excluding the last two and highest grade completed and race) reference the proportion of years since leaving the parental home that the respondent was in the particular status.

[1]See Table 9 for significance level glossary.

Table 12 Determinants of Proportion of Survey Years Receiving Welfare Since Leaving Parental Home for Respondents Ever Receiving Welfare: Ordinary Least Squares Unstandardized Regression Coefficients

(t values in parentheses)[1]

	Total		White		Black	
Highest grade completed	.002	.001	-.000	.001	-.007	-.005
	(0.42)	(0.22)	(0.00)	(0.16)	(0.96)	(0.67)
% of surveys living in poverty	.394[a]	.396[a]	.392[a]	.387[a]	.358[a]	.366[a]
	(8.92)	(8.95)	(6.43)	(6.28)	(5.38)	(5.79)
% of surveys never married with children	.316[a]	.281[a]	.475[a]	.475[a]	.279[a]	.215[a]
	(5.99)	(5.18)	(5.27)	(4.97)	(3.95)	(3.19)
% of surveys married, spouse present, with children	-.053	-.063	-.055	-.056	-.007	-.036
	(1.34)	(1.59)	(1.08)	(1.08)	(0.10)	(0.54)
% of surveys separated, divorced, widowed, with children	.256[a]	.240[a]	.229[a]	.237[a]	.301[a]	.240[a]
	(5.22)	(4.87)	(3.45)	(3.49)	(3.96)	(3.30)
% of surveys separated, divorced, widowed, without children	-.051	-.093	-.001	.003	-.341	-.436
	(0.44)	(0.80)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(1.22)	(1.66)
Race (black = 1)	.020	.006	-	-	-	-
	(0.80)	(0.22)				
% of surveys in metropolitan area	.011	.015	-.019	-.020	.128[a]	.129[a]
	(0.45)	(0.63)	(0.60)	(0.62)	(2.82)	(3.01)
% of surveys in South	-.094[a]	-.085[a]	-.109[a]	-.114[a]	-.052[c]	-.012
	(3.79)	(3.37)	(3.22)	(3.29)	(1.43)	(0.33)
% of surveys with health problem	.058	.059	.025	.029	.052	.030
	(1.12)	(1.15)	(0.34)	(0.39)	(0.69)	(0.43)
% of surveys worked 26 weeks or more	-.175[a]	-.171[a]	-.150[a]	-.150[a]	-.229[a]	-.247[a]
	(4.59)	(4.50)	(2.91)	(2.89)	(3.74)	(4.26)
Received welfare most years with parents	-	.075[a]	-	-.004	-	.131[a]
		(2.50)		(0.08)		(4.26)
In poverty most years with parents	-	-.026	-	.029	-	-.094
		(0.98)		(0.72)		(2.87)
Constant	.252	.265	.293	.275	.295	.288
R^2 (adj.)	.678	.683	.623	.619	.694	.733
F ratio	54.03	46.93	24.64	20.38	31.12	31.49
N	278	278	144	144	134	134

NOTE: Universe = (1) must reside with parents in 1968, (2) must have left parents by 1973 and (3) interviewed all surveys 1968-1980. All of the independent variables (excluding the last two and highest grade completed and race) reference the proportion of years since leaving the parental home that the respondent was in the particular status.

[1]See Table 9 for significance level glossary.

Appendix Table A1 Mean Characteristics of Respondents Who Ever Received and Never Received Welfare Since Leaving Parental Home

Characteristic[1]	Ever received welfare			Never received welfare		
	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black
Years of education completed, 1978	11.8	12.0	11.5	13.6	13.6	12.8
Percent of surveys in poverty[2]	29.7	23.5	47.3	4.0	3.9	5.1
Percent of surveys never married with child in household[2]	10.6	3.6	30.6	0.3	0.1	3.9
Percent of surveys married with child in household[2]	50.5	55.9	35.1	47.1	46.5	57.7
Percent of surveys separated/widowed/ divorced with child in household[2]	15.8	14.0	20.8	2.3	2.0	6.8
Percent of surveys separted/widowed/ divorced without child in household[2]	2.3	2.7	1.1	2.9	3.0	1.5
Percent of surveys living in central city or suburb of SMSA[2]	72.5	68.9	82.7	71.5	71.2	76.4
Percent of surveys living in South[2]	27.7	22.7	42.2	30.7	29.0	63.9
Percent of surveys reporting a health problem[2]	9.0	8.2	11.3	5.5	5.6	4.5
Percent of surveys worked 26 weeks or more in past year[2]	40.1	40.2	39.7	61.3	61.2	64.6
Percent black	25.9	-	-	4.8	-	-
Percent with parents in poverty most surveys[3]	29.1	19.2	57.2	7.7	5.6	50.2
Percent with parents receiving welfare most surveys[3]	19.7	9.6	48.6	2.8	1.9	19.6
Number of respondents	278	144	134	914	792	122

[1]Weighted mean characteristics.

[2]Percent of surveys between when respondent left parental home and 1980 in specified status.

[3]Fifty percent or more of surveys which respondent lived in parental home between 1968 and 1972.

Appendix Table A2 Mean Characteristics of Respondents Who Ever Received Welfare More or Less than 26 Percent of the Surveys Since Leaving Parental Home[1]

Characteristic	Received welfare 1-25 % of surveys			Received welfare 26% or more of surveys		
	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black
Years of education completed, 1978	12.1	12.2	11.8	11.5	11.6	11.4
Percent of surveys in poverty[2]	15.3	13.8	25.4	45.5	39.1	55.0
Percent of surveys never married with child in household[2]	2.8	0.0	21.8	19.3	9.5	33.7
Percent of surveys married with child in household[2]	60.3	62.3	46.5	39.7	45.6	31.1
Percent of surveys separated/widowed/ divorced with child in household[2]	31.0	28.5	48.8	47.8	35.6	65.7
Percent of surveys separated/widowed/ divorced without child in household[2]	2.3	2.4	1.8	2.2	3.2	0.9
Percent of surveys living in central city or suburb of SMSA[2]	69.4	68.8	73.7	75.9	69.1	85.9
Percent of surveys living in South[2]	32.1	27.7	62.1	22.9	14.5	35.3
Percent of surveys reporting a health problem[2]	5.8	5.6	6.9	12.6	12.4	12.9
Percent of surveys worked 26 weeks or more in past year[2]	46.1	44.2	59.7	33.3	33.7	32.7
Percent black	12.8	-	-	40.4	-	-
Percent with parents in poverty most surveys[3]	22.3	16.9	59.2	36.5	23.0	56.5
Percent with parents receiving welfare most surveys[3]	8.1	6.2	20.5	32.5	15.0	58.4
Number of respondents	129	89	40	149	55	94

[1]Weighted mean characteristics.

[2]Percent of surveys between when respondent left parental home and 1980 in specified status.

[3]Fifty percent or more of surveys which respondent lived in parental home between 1968 and 1972.

Appendix Table A3 Mean Characteristics of Respondents Who Were Receiving Welfare or Not Receiving Welfare in 1978[1]

Characteristic	Received welfare			Didn't received welfare		
	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black
Years of education completed, 1978	10.9	10.8	11.1	13.4	13.4	12.3
Poverty ratio, 1978[2]	1.32	1.33	1.29	3.79	3.85	2.84
Percent never married with child in household, 1978	19.5	9.5	37.8	0.9	0.3	10.4
Percent married with child in household, 1978	27.1	36.6	9.7	65.8	65.9	64.2
Percent separated/widowed/divorced with child in household, 1978	42.9	43.0	42.7	3.9	3.3	12.1
Percent separated/widowed/divorced without child in household, 1978	3.9	4.8	2.2	5.2	5.4	1.5
Percent living in central city of suburb of SMSA, 1978	71.6	60.9	91.0	72.1	71.7	77.7
Percent living in South, 1978	23.8	20.5	29.8	30.8	28.7	61.0
Percent reporting a health problem, 1978	21.2	23.0	18.1	7.5	7.5	7.1
Weeks worked in past year, 1978	17.2	20.6	11.1	31.5	30.9	40.8
Percent of surveys receiving welfare since leaving parental home	56.1	48.0	70.7	3.0	2.4	12.5
Percent ever receiving welfare since leaving parental home	-	-	-	12.3	10.5	38.7
Percent black	35.5	-	-	6.5	-	-
Percent with parents in poverty most surveys[3]	34.6	20.9	59.5	9.6	7.0	47.3
Percent with parents receiving welfare most surveys[3]	27.3	5.9	66.4	4.2	3.0	21.8
Number of respondents	108	47	61	913	751	162

[1]Weighted mean characteristics.
[2]The poverty ratio is the ratio of family income during 1977 to the poverty line for that year for families of given size. See text note 7.
[3]Fifty percent or more of surveys which respondent lived in parental home between 1968 and 1972.